DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 261 125 UD 024 425

AUTHOR Stavros, Denny; Moore, JoAnne E.
TITLE Two Perspectives on School Climate: Do Staff and Students See a School the Same Way?
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 50p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 31-April 4, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Educational Environment; High Schools; School Administration; *School Effectiveness; *School Personnel; School Role; *Student Attitudes; Student School Relationship; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Detroit Public Schools MI

ABSTRACT

Two studies of school climate were conducted at Detroit's Boulevard High School in 1984, three years after the institution of a school improvement program. One study measured students' perceptions, the other assessed staff perceptions. Based upon the findings of this research, it became clear that in order to get a good picture of the school climate, data from both students and staff were needed. Staff and students had convergent opinions in many areas. The school's academic program was viewed positively by both groups. Students were positive about guidance and counseling, the curriculum, and the instruction. The staff were positive about related areas: frequent monitoring of student progress, and opportunity to learn and time-on-task. They viewed the department head, especially in the role of instructional leader, in a positive light. The staff did not feel safe in the school (and students did not participate in activities which would cause them to remain at school after hours). Both students and staff were generally satisfied with the school, but had negative perceptions concerning Boulevard's administration. The staff viewed the principal as accessible but as a poor instructional leader. Students felt that the administration was not accessible, and they were not involved in the decision making process. And finally, while staff tended to have low expectations of student performance, students felt they were learning almost all they could and learning a lot in most or all classes. (Following the narrative, tabulated questionnaire responses are appended). (KH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Denny Stavros

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED261125

TWO PERSPECTIVES ON SCHOOL CLIMATE: DO STAFF AND STUDENTS SEE A SCHOOL THE SAME WAY?

Denny Stavros, Ph.D.
and
JoAnne E. Moore, Ph.D.
Detroit Public Schools

Paper presented at the 1985 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
March 31 - April 4, 1985

UD024425

TWO PERSPECTIVES ON SCHOOL CLIMATE: DO STAFF AND STUDENTS SEE A SCHOOL THE SAME WAY?

Introduction and Methodology

In response to declining academic performance among Detroit high school students,[1] the High School Improvement Project[2] was mounted by the Detroit Public Schools. This massive, multi-phased program[3] was funded by the Ford Foundation during the 1981-1982 school year. The duration of the funding was through the 1984-1985 school year.

Based on recommendations prepared by a school system task force, local school improvement programs were instituted in eight senior high schools: one in each of Detroit's then eight administrative regions. The key unit in each project school was the school planning team, composed of administration and teacher representatives and often a parent and a student. This group was augmented with central and regional office staff as well as county intermediate school district representation. Among this support group was a project evaluator assigned to each school planning team from the Research and Evaluation Department.

Change was viewed as occurring through local school problem definitions and consensus-derived solutions: the products of the school planning team's deliberations. In addition, a continuing program of inservice training was instituted to inform regional and central office liaison staff and key school persons, i.e., the principal and the school facilitator, of school improvement methodologies, strategies, philosophies and research findings.[4]

Each evaluator was expected to provide the local school planning team with school descriptor information[5] (e.g., test score data), respond to questions raised by team members that related to research bearing on effective

schools and teaching, and reports on promising practices for school improvement, participate in team deliberations and serve on subcommittees, assess school climate among staff and students by administering questionnaires to both groups, and administer a team assessment (process) questionnaire to team members.

Data reported in this paper proceed from the charge to all project evaluators to sample school climates among both students and staff. The purpose was to establish, early on, an inventory of school climate as well as an initial assessment against which future assessments could be compared.

The Student Opinion Inventory[6] was used at the Boulevard high school to measure students' perceptions of their school milieu and their experiences there. This instrument has 34 questions with five response choices per question, ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." For the purpose of analysis, questions were sorted topically into six school-descriptor categories: student activities, instruction, curriculum, guidance and counseling, school morale, and school administration.

The procedure of randomly selecting classes, used in the 1982 and 1983 student surveys, was repeated in 1984. For grades nine, eleven and twelve, selection was made from social studies classes; for grade ten, biology classes were sampled. Selection was made using random numbers with the number chosen per grade dictated by the proportion each grade contributed to the total school enrollment.[7] In all three surveys, the teacher administering the questionnaire was asked to read a short statement explaining the purpose of the survey.[8]

The questionnaire used in the survey of staff perceptions was the second revised edition, July, 1982, of the School Effectiveness Questionnaire. This instrument was originally developed by the Connecticut State Department of Education[9] to serve as a component in that agency's School Effectiveness Assessment Process at the elementary school level. The instrument was first modified by the present authors, so as to reflect the instructional program in Detroit's high schools. Items addressing elementary school procedures and curriculum were delected. The administrative roles played by the principal and the department head were explicated. A second revision followed the administration of an abbreviated version (80 items) at Boulevard High school in June, 1982. The questionnaire was shortened to 48 items and additional changes were made in the content. Notwithstanding the changes made, the conceptual nature and structure of the instrument was retained. The Connecticut instrument, as well as the Detroit adaptation, provided for an assessment of staff perceptions of school and instructional effectiveness behaviors and policies vis-a-vis seven research-derived characteristics. These were: safe and orderly environment, clear school mission, instructional leadership, high expectations, opportunity to learn and student time-on-task, frequent monitoring of student progress, and home-school relations.[10]

In 1984, from a staff of 92, 86 usable questionnaires (93 percent of the staff) were returned. These 86 questionnaires provided the data used in this study.

Demographic Characteristics of the Boulevard Community

Located within the inner third of the city, Boulevard high school's attendance area occupies the majority of two contiguous subcommunities: roughly three-fourths of one subcommunity and two-thirds of the other. (A subcommunity is an aggregate of contiguous census tracts; Detroit has 51 subcommunities.)

On most demographic descriptors, the two subcommunities differed slightly--one or two percentage points, and the average of the two, used here to describe Boulevard's milieu, was, for many descriptors, dissimilar from the city as a whole.

In 1980, the two subcommunities' combined population was 72,343 and 95 percent black. The city's black population was just under two-thirds of the total.

Median household income (April, 1979) was $9,350 and $10,537, respectively, for the two subcommunities in comparison to approximately $14,000 for the city.

Median family income (April, 1979) was $11,247 and $12,735, respectively, and $17,245, city-wide.

The unemployment rate (April, 1980) for persons 16 and older was approximately one-fourth in the Boulevard milieu, but under one-fifth in the city.

Approximately one-fourth of the Boulevard community work force was employed as technicians, salespersons and administrative support workers, or as service personnel or operatives. City percents for the same occupational categories were 30, 19 and 25, respectively.

Approximately one-third of the households in the Boulevard community were in poverty in comparison to less than one-fourth of the city's.

Just over half of Boulevard community's children under eighteen resided in one-parent households. The total for the city as a whole was 40 percent.

Approximately two-thirds of the housing structures in the Boulevard subcommunities were built in 1939 or earlier. City-wide, just under half were over 40 years old.

Mean values of owner-occupied housing units for the two subcommunities were approximately $19,500 and $16,100, respectively, but the city mean was approximately $23,250.

Average monthly rents for renter units were $140 and $134, respectively, in comparison to a city average of $165.

Households lacking the availability of a vehicle, i.e., automobile, van or light truck, were 45 and 35 percent, respectively, for the two subcommunities. Just over one-fourth of the city's households lacked comparable transportation.

One-fourth of Boulevard community persons 25 years of age and older had an eighth grade education or less. One-twentieth had graduated from college. For the city, the proportions were slightly more favorable.

Boulevard High School

Boulevard high school is the city's fifth oldest high school. Opened in 1914, the original structure stood at the very limits of a fast growing city. A new structure was built and first occupied in 1972. The Fourth Friday official enumeration for Fall, 1983, listed 1926 students, of whom 72 were in

special education. With the exception of four American Indians and one white, the student population was entirely black.

The weighted, composite poverty index for the Boulevard high school in 1984 was 46.68. This was the fourth highest index among all city high schools and easily entitled Boulevard to Chapter 1 funding.[11] While over half of the students were eligible to participate in the free and reduced-in-price lunch program, most of the eligible students did not participate. For example, the average proportion participating during January, 1982, was 20 percent.

With the emphasis on graduating students with marketable skills or college entrance prerequisites, the Detroit Public Schools has provided its students opportunities to develop marketable skills through its vocational/technical centers. One-fourth of the combined eleventh and twelfth grade enrollment (March, 1984) at Boulevard attended a vocational/technical center on a half-day basis. The average proportion for all HSIP schools was the same. However, just over a third of the students (1983-84) were enrolled in a science class. The average for HSIP schools was 44 percent. Ninth grade algebra enrollment at Boulevard high school was slightly higher than the HSIP average, 30 percent in comparison to 26 percent, for the 1983-84 school year.

Eleventh grade students were the single grade group in high school tested on a norm-referenced test. The performance of the Boulevard students in mean grade-equivalent units on the CAT (California Achievement Test) in reading was 10.1 and in math was 10.3 for 1984. City-wide mean grade-equivalent scores were 10.3, reading and 10.9, math; national means were 11.7 on both subtests.

On the High School Proficiency Examinations, administered to tenth grade students, Boulevard's tenth graders compared favorably with the averages for

both project and non-project high schools in 1984. Seventy-eight percent passed the reading section (75 and 77 percent for the two comparison aggregates); 57 percent passed the writing section (55 and 57 percent for the two comparison aggregates); and 33 percent passed the mathematics section (35 and 36 percent for the two comparison aggregates).

The exclusion rate[12] at Boulevard high school in 1983-84 was 766, and the suspension rate for the same school year was 96. Both rates were above the HSIP average as well as the non-HSIP average.

Average daily attendance for a sample week in the Fall semester at Boulevard high school was 81.2 percent, and for a sample week in the Spring semester, it was 84.5 percent. These percentages approximated the averages for HSIP and non-HSIP schools during the same sampling weeks.

Students' Perceptions of The School

The results of the student survey conducted in 1984 indicate that students felt most positively about the academic program at Boulevard high school and least positively about the school's administration. School morale was rated somewhat positively, while student activities were seen in a less positive light.

Evidence of the positive perception of students concerning the school's academic program may be found in student responses to items in three areas: guidance and counseling, curriculum, and instruction.

Among the services provided by counselors listed in the survey instrument, assistance in course selection was most favorably assessed (68 percent positive responses). Overall, 65 percent of the students were satisfied or

very satisfied with the way their counselors treated them. Other items rated positively by students in this area were help in the selection of a college, vocational or trade school (60 percent) and help in the selection of a vocation (52 percent). Helping students with personal problems was the least favorably assessed (41 percent positive responses). These results indicate that students felt that their counselors performed the duties related to the academic program of the school to their satisfaction. The remaining question in this group asked students to express their degree of satisfaction with the way they were treated by their counselors. Sixty-five percent of the students indicated satisfaction. On all items, ninth and tenth grade students were the most positive.

In the area of curriculum, more than half of Boulevard's students responded positively to each of the items. There was significant variation among the grade levels on all questions with students in the ninth and tenth grades responding more positively than students in the eleventh and twelfth grades. The highest positive response was made to the question, "Regardless of what your grades may be, in how many of your school subjects would you say that you are learning a lot this year?" Sixty-four percent of the students responding indicated either most or all. Sixty percent of the students indicated that they were learning almost all or all they could from their school work, and that they were satisfied with the variety of subjects that the school offers. Fifty-six percent of the students responded that most or everything that they were studying would be useful to them in everyday living. Fifty-two percent indicated that most or all of the things they should be learning were being taught at the school.

However, there was greater uniformity of response across grade levels in the area of instruction. Overall, two-thirds of the students (67 percent) said that teachers usually or always clearly explained how assignments were to be done. Sixty-five percent indicated that teachers usually or always explained what to do on an assignment, and the same percent said that teachers usually gave them most or all the help they needed with their school work. Sixty percent said that either most or all of their teachers made sure that they understood what they taught in class. Fifty-nine percent said that most or all of their teachers seemed to care if they learned the subject they targht. Just under half the students (49 percent) said that all or most of their courses were taught using satisfactory teaching methods. Forty-two percent said that most or all of their teachers were willing to give students individual help outside of class. However, only 36 percent said that most or all of their teachers gave them personal encouragement in their school work.

These three areas comprise what might be described as the academic program of the school, and student responses indicate that they were most positive toward the school's academic program.

At the opposite end of the spectrum, students felt that the administration was the weakest component of Boulevard high school. There was considerable uniformity of response to the six items in this category. On three of the four questions where the school's administration was viewed negatively, differences among grade level means were not statistically significant. There were significant differences among grade levels in their responses to the way the administration included students in making decisions about matters directly affecting students. Half of the eleventh and twelfth grade students

expressed dissatisfaction in this area, while only a third of the ninth and tenth graders were dissatisfied. Overall, 59 percent were dissatisfied.

The item which received the most negative response asked if the administration talked to students as individuals on all occasions. Sixty-three percent of the respondents said seldom or never. Half of the students indicated that the administration seldom or never seemed to really care about them as individuals. Nearly half (46 percent) said that the administration gave them little or none of the personal encouragement they needed concerning their school work.

The two remaining items yielded more ambiguous results. Almost half of the students (46 percent) said they would have to wait less than a day to communicate a suggestion or a problem to the administration. However, 15 percent felt they could not talk at all. When asked how satisfied they were with the way they were treated by the administration, 25 percent were very dissatisfied, 40 percent were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 36 percent were satisfied. It should be noted that the percentage of students expressing the moderate position outnumbered the percentage expressing either positive or negative opinions for this item.

In the area of school morale, responses to four items resulted in approximately half of the students responding favorably to three of the questions and two-thirds responding favorably to a fourth.

The most favorable response (65 percent) was made to the question, "How often do you feel that you 'belong' in your school?" The favorable responses were usually and always. Only 14 percent said seldom or never.

The general level of satisfaction with the school was assessed at 52 percent responding either satisfied or very satisfied. School spirit (i.e., students' support of athletic teams, charity drives, class money-raising projects, etc.) was rated as good or excellent by 49 percent of the students. Finally, 47 percent of the students indicated that they were proud or very proud of Boulevard high school.

The final area assessed in the student questionnaire was student activities. The responses to these items were evenly split. The three questions related to variety of activities, quality of activities, and level of acceptance received favorable responses. The three questions related to participation received unfavorable responses.

More specifically, 57 percent of the students indicated satisfaction with the variety of student activities offered, 52 percent of the students indicated satisfaction with the quality of student activities, and 51 percent indicated that they would be accepted in most or all of the activities at Boulevard high. The number of activities in which the respondents felt students were involved in the planning of the activity was none (22 percent), few (30 percent), about half (27 percent), many (15 percent) and all (7 percent). When asked how many of the activities in which they would like to participate did they participate, students reported none (15 percent), few (30 percent), about half (24 percent), most (20 percent) and all (13 percent). It appears, based upon these data, that students who want to participate in activities are able to do so. The final question in this area asked students how many sponsors of the activities in which they participated seemed well suited to the activity. None or few were cited by 34 percent, 23 percent said about half, and 44 percent said most or all.

To summarize student perceptions of Boulevard high school, the academic program, including guidance and counseling, curriculum, and instruction, was rated most favorably. School administration was rated most negatively by students. School morale and student activities received the least definitive ratings.

Staff's Perceptions of The School

The results of the staff survey conducted at Boulevard high school in 1984 indicate that staff responded most positively toward the role of the department head as an instructional leader, the frequent monitoring of student progress, and the opportunity to learn and student time-on-task. They indicated a reasonably positive feeling about home/school relations. Staff responded least favorably toward high expectations (for students). The areas of safe and orderly environment, clear school mission, and the principal as instructional leader also were seen in a less favorable light.

Evidence of the positive reception of the department head as an instructional leader comes from responses to items which outline the stages in the formal classroom observation process. Over half the staff agreed that their department head made several formal classroom observations each year. Equal proportions (40 percent) agreed and disagreed that the department head met with the teacher prior to an observation to discuss what would be observed. Over half of the staff indicated that a post-observation conference usually followed a formal observation. Forty percent reported that an instructional improvement plan usually resulted from this conference. Forty-six percent felt that improved instructional practices often resulted from

discussions with department heads. Sixty percent viewed the department head as a source to be consulted for instructional concerns and problems. The most consistently high response from the staff (74 percent) indicated that department heads required and regularly reviewed lesson plans.

Frequent monitoring of student progress received positive responses from a large proportion of the Boulevard staff. This factor was assessed by five items. Sixty-three percent of the staff indicated that there was a regular, systematic assessment of students' basic skills in most classrooms; 56 percent indicated that multiple assessment methods were used, and 60 percent indicated that teachers gave students specific feedback on daily assignments. Forty-four percent of staff indicated that criterion-referenced tests were used to assess basic skills throughout the school. One area where staff expressed dissatisfaction related to monitoring was the standardized testing program: 40 percent felt that it was not a valid and reliable measure of the basic skills curriculum.

Staff responses were positive on three of the five items in the area of opportunity to learn and student time-on-task. These three items were areas where teachers had control: their own classrooms. Seventy-one percent said that daily lesson plans typically included teacher presentations, student practice, specific feedback, and evaluation of student performance. Fifty-three percent indicated that class atmosphere was, generally, very conducive to learning for all students. Fifty-seven percent indicated that teachers plan assignments so that students would be highly successful during the practice work that followed direct instruction. Fifty-four percent of staff responding indicated that there were many interruptions during class time,

something over which they had little or no control. The remaining item concerned the use of class time for seatwork. The respondents were almost equally divided on this issue.

Seven items assessed the home/school relations factor. Those items which represented school initiated activities received high levels of positive response. To wit: 76 percent of staff responders indicated that there was a focus on student basic skills mastery during parent-teacher conferences, 72 percent said that teachers and parents were aware of the school's homework policy, 70 percent said that teachers used several means beyond parent conferences and report cards to communicate with parents, and 52 percent said that parent-teacher conferences resulted in specific home/school cooperation aimed at improving student classroom achievement. The three remaining items received very low positive ratings and were matters over which teachers had very little control. To wit: 13 percent agreed that all students completed assigned homework before coming to school (73 percent disagreed), 20 percent indicated that most parents would rate this school as superior (71 percent disagreed), and 38 percent said there was an active parent-school group that involved many parents (51 percent disagreed).

In the area of high expectations, the staff gave the least positive assessment for the entire questionnaire. All five items resulted in negative responses. Seventy-two percent indicated that low-achieving students presented more discipline problems than other students, 61 percent felt that most of the present ninth grade students could not be expected to complete high school (only 28 percent responded positively), 54 percent said that low-achieving students did not usually answer questions as often as other students

in their classrooms, and only 34 percent indicated that teachers believed that they were responsible for all students mastering all basic skills at each grade level (48 percent disagreed). Responses were divided on the item which stated teachers believed that every student in this school could master basic skills as a direct result of the instructional program (46 percent disagreed, 42 percent agreed).

In the area of safe and orderly environment, the Boulevard staff gave high marks to the school's physical appearance and cleanliness (91 percent were favorable) and 86 percent felt that the building was neat, bright, clean and comfortable. However, the staff felt that security was an issue at the school (80 percent agreed) and that the school was not a safe and secure place to work (63 percent agreed). Relative to students, 67 percent of the staff felt that discipline was a problem and the same percentage indicated that most students were neither eager nor enthusiastic about learning. Staff was undecided on the issue of students abiding by school rules; 45 percent agreed, and 59 percent disagreed.

The clear school mission factor was assessed by three items. Over half (53 percent) of the staff responding disagreed that a written statement of purpose existed that was the driving force behind most important decisions. The majority (64 percent) felt that reteaching and specific skill remediation were important parts of the teaching process. The use of the High School Proficiency Exam results to program students into appropriate classes received mixed support: 27 percent agreed, 45 percent disagreed, and 28 percent were undecided.

The final category assessed was the principal as instructional leader. Eight items addressed this area. Only 34 percent of the staff agreed that the principal was an important instructional resource person in the school (56 percent disagreed). Only 30 percent agreed that the principal led frequent formal discussions concerning instruction and student achievement (49 percent disagreed). Only 38 percent agreed that there was clear, strong, centralized instructional leadership from the principal (42 percent disagreed). Fewer than half (44 percent) of the staff agreed that the principal was very active in securing resources, arranging opportunities and promoting staff development activities for the faculty (47 percent disagreed). The Boulevard staff felt that the principal was accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction (57 percent agreed), but was not high visible throughout the school (56 percent). Staff disagreed (57 percent) with the statement that the principal rarely made informal contacts with students and teachers aroung the school. Finally, 58 percent of the staff agreed that most problems facing the school could be solved by the principal and faculty without a great deal of outside help.

To summarize staff perceptions of Boulevard high, the department head was perceived as an instructional leader by most staff members. Student work was frequently monitored, students were afforded opportunities to learn and student time-on-task was encouraged. Staff felt positively about home/school relations where they had control. They also felt the school building was pleasant and clean, but felt less positively about their own and their students' safety. The school mission was not clear to them. The principal was accessible but received low marks as an instructional leader. The area

which elicited the least favorable responses from staff was high expectations for students.

Similarities and Differences Between Staff and Student Perceptions

The academic program at Boulevard high school was viewed most positively by both groups. Students were positive about guidance and counseling, the curriculum, and the instruction. The staff also was positive about related areas: frequent monitoring of student progress, and opportunity to learn and time-on-task. They viewed the department head, especially in the role of instructional leader in a positive light.

Staff's perceptions of the school as a safe and orderly environment area were reflected in students' responses to items concerning student activities. The staff did not feel safe, and students did not participate in activities which would cause them to remain at school, especially after hours. Students felt they belonged to the school, and more than half were satisfied with the school. The staff also liked the school, i.e., they felt positively about the building and its appearance.

Both staff and students had negative perceptions concerning Boulevard's administration. The staff indicated that they viewed the principals as accessible but as a poor instructional leader. Students felt that the administration was not accessible to them, and they were not involved in the decision making process. This category received the least positive response from both groups.

While there was considerable homogeneity in staff and student responses, staff tended to have low expectations of student performance. Students,

however, felt they were learning almost all they could and learning a lot in most or all of their classes. This may be explained, in part, by Shoemaker and Pecheone's observation, "the expectations scale is the least reliable and the validity of measuring attitudes with a self-report scale is questionable."[13] Another explanation for this discrepancy is that students have few reference groups other than their own, while staff can make comparisons to multiple reference groups.

Conclusions

Based upon the findings of this research, it appears that in order to get a good picture of the school climate, data from both students and staff must be collected. Although staff and students have convergent opinions in many areas, their perspectives are sufficiently different so that a well-rounded assessment of the school requires data from both groups. Therefore, the answer to the major question posed by this paper, can the data from one group be used as a surrogate for the data from another, must be no, not in most cases.

Footnotes

[1]In an abstract of the Ford Foundation proposal provided local school planning teams, the following summarized the plight of academic achievement among Detroit's high school population:

> The scores of eleventh grade Detroit students given standardized norm referenced tests show that, while 50 percent of the nation's students are at or above grade level, only 30 percent of Detroit's students were at or above grade level in reading and only 32 percent in mathematics. In both reading and mathematics, 23 percent of the national norms group are above average. Detroit's first grade students exceed the national norms group with 29 percent above average. In the high school, however, only 9 percent of the Detroit's students are above average.

[2]Hereafter referred to as HSIP.

[3]Six general phases were identified. They were team building, planning, implementation, evaluation-modification-continuation-expansion, evaluation, and dissemination.

[4]The position of school facilitator was created and funded by the HSIP with .4 full time equivalent teacher service provided to free the school facilitator from teaching and/or department head duties. In theory and usually in practice, the functioning of the HSIP was dependent upon the school facilitator. Assigned tasks included assisting the principal in leading the planning and implementation process, acting to interface with the total school staff, arranging for resources and training for the school planning team, writing drafts of the school plan, arranging documentation of the school effort, etc.

[5]An elaborate set of tables was prepared by the senior author and presented to the Boulevard high school HSIP team. Besides the results on the CAT in reading and mathematics for ninth and eleventh grade students at Boulevard high school for years 1973 to 1981, and the results on the same two subtest areas on the CAT and ITBS test for feeder school students (1973-1981), tabular displays produced included the following information for the Boulevard student body: drop-out percents for each grade, 1970-71 to 1979-80; enrollment counts by grade, 1970 to 1981, and ninth/twelfth grade and tenth/twelfth grade enrollment ratios, 1970 to 1979; average daily attendance for two sample weeks per school year, 1976 to 1981; percents not promoted in the four major academic areas (English, social studies, mathematics, and science), 1973 to 1977, and percents not promoted by number of subjects failed, 1974 to 1978; and percents passing the High School Proficiency Examination per competency area, 1979-80 to 1981-82.

For both Boulevard high school and its feeder schools, i.e., middle and, in some cases, elementary schools, the following information was presented in tabular form: percent of families in poverty per school attendance area, 1973-74 to 1981-82; percent of non-promotions per grade, 1980-81; average percents receiving free or reduced-in-price lunches, January, 1982; numbers of students excluded for illegal or prohibited behavior, 1980-81; incidences of illegal behavior resulting in exclusion by violation types and categories, 1980-81; incidences of prohibited behavior resulting in exclusion by violation types and categories, 1980-81; and dispositions of suspensions, 1980-81.

In the second and subsequent program years, school descriptor information was prepared centrally for all eight project schools and, for the most part, limited to test results, attendance and drop-out percents.

[6]Was developed by the National Study of School Evaluation, Falls Church, Virginia. See Clinton I. Chase, "Ten Thousand Students View Their High Schools," High School Journal, Oct.-Nov., 1982, pp. 36-41, for an analysis of the questionnaire responses of high school students in twenty-four school systems across twenty-two states.

A few of the HSIP evaluators administered this instrument during the project's first year. By the third year, this instrument was used exclusively by those who surveyed student climate.

[7]A total of twenty-one classes participated in the survey: eight ninth grade social studies classes or 38 percent of the study sample; six tenth grade biology classes (half were general and half were lab biology) or 29 percent of the study sample; four eleventh grade social studies classes or 19 percent of the study sample; and three twelfth grade social studies classes or 14 percent of the study sample of classes. Percents of the total school enrollment in March, 1984, for the four grades were: ninth grade, 39 percent; tenth grade, 28 percent; eleventh grade, 20 percent; and twelfth grade, 14 percent.

It should be noted that sixteen percent of the answer sheets were returned with grade placement unmarked. The resulting distribution of answer sheets returned with marked grade placement was at avriance with the above enrollment or study sample distributions. The distribution of returned grade-marked answer sheets by grade was: 31 percent ninth grade, 23 percent tenth grade, 25 percent eleventh grade, and 21 percent twelfth grade. The difference between enrollment and answer sheet in grade count was statistically significant: ($x^2 = 21.1$, $df = 3$, $p < .01$).

The responses of 469 students, or 25 percent of the school enrollment, are reported in this paper.

[8]"This class is one of many in our school which is being asked to fill out the questionnaire you have been given. Before you start, I would like to tell you why you are asked to do this. Boulevard high school is one of eight Detroit high schools participating in a four year school improvement project. Out school has received a grant of over $25,150 to support our third year of project activities. The goal of the project is to improve teaching and learning at Boulevard. Since December, 1981, a committee of teachers, counselors, administrators, and a parent have been holding meetings to plan ways and means for working toward school improvement goals. You are asked to help in this effort. Your honest answers to the questions in this questionnaire will help the committee learn what is most needed to improve our school."

In fact, the response frequencies in tabular form for students and teachers, from both the 1983 and 1984 surveys, were distributed among the Boulevard staff and discussions were held on how to cope with the more negative findings.

[9]Robert M. Villanova, William J. Gauthier, Jr.; C. Patrick Proctor; and Joan Shoemaker, "The Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire." Hartford, CT: Connecticut State Department of Education, 1981. See also The Connecticut School Effectiveness Project, Development and Assessment, Hartford, CT: Connecticut State Department of Education, December, 1981; Joan Shoemaker and Raymond Pecheone, "Are The School Effectiveness Characteristics Alterable? A Connecticut Perspective." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of AERA, April 23-27, 1984.

[10]William J. Gauthier, Jr., "The Connecticut School Improvement Project," in The Connecticut School Effectiveness Project, Development and Assessment, Hartford, CT: Connecticut State Department of Education, December, 1981, p.4.

[11]The weighted, composite poverty index is used to determine Chapter 1 eligibility as well as the allocation of Chapter 1 funds to eligible schools. It is derived, in part, by calculating the percent of families, in the 1980 census, whose income was at or below poverty level per census tract (weighted .85 in the 1984 equation) and the percent of students enrolled in public and private schools receiving AFDC assistance in January, 1983, per census tract (weighted .15 in the 1984 equation). Boulevard high school received approximately $61,000 in Chapter 1 funding in the 1983-84 school year.

[12]Both rates are based on the number of exclusions per 1000 enrolled students.

[13]Op. cit., p. 8.

Appendix A

Responses to Student Questionnaire

A. STUDENT ACTIVITIES

In how many of the student activities that you participate in are the students involved in planning the activity?

(Student Opinion Question 1)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	None	Few	About Half	Many	All		
9	27%	31%	29%	7%	7%	(119)	2.4
10	24	30	25	14	8	(89)	2.5
11	19	31	24	25	2	(98)	2.6
12	15	27	32	15	11	(81)	2.8
Total	22	30	27	15	7	(387)	2.5

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was not significant at the .05 level.

In how many of the activities of your school would you feel that you would be accepted?

(Student Opinion Question 2)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	None	Few	About Half	Most	All		
9	2%	27%	25%	36%	11%	(123)	3.3
10	0	16	24	46	14	(90)	3.6
11	1	21	34	27	17	(98)	3.4
12	1	20	26	31	22	(81)	3.5
Total	1	21	27	35	16	(392)	3.4

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was not significant at the .05 level.

How many student activities (clubs, parties, plays, athletics, etc.) that you would like to participate in, do you participate in?

(Student Opinion Question 3)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	None	Few	About Half	Most	All		
9	16%	39%	21%	16%	9%	(122)	2.6
10	18	21	22	26	13	(90)	3.0
11	10	26	31	21	12	(98)	3.0
12	15	31	21	16	17	(81)	2.9
Total	15	30	24	20	13	(391)	2.9

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was not significant at the .05 level.

How many sponsors of the activities that you participate in seem well suited to the activity?

(Student Opinion Question 5)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	None	Few	About Half	Most	All		
9	14%	23%	16%	23%	24%	(121)	3.2
10	17	17	18	28	20	(89)	3.2
11	6	29	25	32	9	(98)	3.1
12	10	17	36	24	14	(81)	3.1
Total	12	22	23	27	17	(389)	3.2

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was not significant at the .05 level.

How satisfied are you with the variety of student activities that your school offers?

(Student Opinion Question 33)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	Very Dis-satisfied	Dis-satisfied	Neither S Nor D	Satisfied	Very Satisfied		
9	1%	3%	20%	52%	24%	(111)	4.0
10	2	5	26	45	22	(87)	3.8
11	3	19	43	30	5	(98)	3.1
12	5	13	35	40	8	(80)	3.3
Total	3	10	31	42	15	(376)	3.6

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was significant at the .01 level.

The t-Test comparisons between grade means were significant at the .05 level for grades nine and eleven, nine and twelve and ten and eleven, ten and twelve.

How satisfied are you with the quality of student activities that your school offers?

(Student Opinion Question 34)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	Very Dis-satisfied	Dis-satisfied	Neither S Nor D	Satisfied	Very Satisfied		
9	2%	1%	33%	46%	18%	(110)	3.8
10	2	6	27	55	9	(85)	3.6
11	5	18	46	23	7	(95)	3.1
12	3	15	37	39	6	(79)	3.3
Total	3	10	36	41	11	(369)	3.5

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was significant at the .01 level.

The t-Test comparisons between grade means were significant at the .05 level for grades nine and eleven, nine and twelve and ten and eleven.

B. INSTRUCTION

How many of your teachers seem to care if you learn the subject they teach?

(Student Opinion Question 6)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	None	Few	About Half	Most	All		
9	3%	20%	9%	27%	42%	(123)	3.8
10	2	19	20	32	27	(90)	3.6
11	4	20	22	32	21	(98)	3.5
12	4	16	28	32	20	(81)	3.5
Total	3	19	19	30	29	(392)	3.6

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was not significant at the .05 level.

How often do your teachers clearly explain what to do on assignments?

(Student Opinion Question 7)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	Never	Seldom	About Half The Time	Usually	Always		
9	1%	13%	16%	32%	38%	(123)	3.9
10	1	14	23	31	30	(90)	3.7
11	0	12	25	39	25	(98)	3.8
12	6	10	21	41	22	(81)	3.6
Total	2	13	21	35	30	(392)	3.8

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was not significant at the .05 level.

How much help do your teachers usually give you with your schoolwork?

(Student Opinion Question 8)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	None I Need	Little I Need	About Half I Need	Most I Need	All I Need		
9	1%	12%	20%	38%	30%	(122)	3.9
10	3	14	19	39	24	(90)	3.7
11	3	15	18	41	22	(98)	3.6
12	5	9	25	42	20	(81)	3.6
Total	3	13	20	40	25	(391)	3.7

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was not significant at the .05 level.

How many of your teachers make sure you understand what they teach in class?

(Student Opinion Question 9)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	None	Few	About Half	Most	All		
9	0%	18%	15%	33%	35%	(123)	3.8
10	2	18	19	41	20	(90)	3.6
11	1	15	28	35	21	(98)	3.6
12	4	20	25	28	24	(81)	3.5
Total	2	18	21	34	26	(392)	3.7

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was not significant at the .05 level.

How often do your teachers clearly explain <u>how</u> assignments are to be done?

(Student Opinion Question 10)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	Never	Seldom	About Half The Time	Usually	Always		
9	3%	4%	15%	40%	37%	(123)	4.0
10	2	8	28	38	24	(90)	3.7
11	2	12	17	38	31	(97)	3.8
12	3	9	33	30	26	(81)	3.7
Total	3	8	22	37	30	(391)	3.8

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was not significant at the .05 level.

How many of your teachers are willing to give students individual help outside of class time?

(Student Opinion Question 11)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	None	Few	About Half	Most	All		
9	12%	27%	18%	29%	15%	(123)	3.1
10	13	27	16	29	16	(90)	3.1
11	8	28	23	32	9	(97)	3.1
12	7	31	24	25	14	(81)	3.1
Total	11	28	20	29	13	(391)	3.1

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was not significant at the .05 level.

How many of your teachers give you enough personal encouragement in your schoolwork?

(Student Opinion Question 12)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	None	Few	About Half	Most	All		
9	14%	28%	18%	26%	14%	(122)	3.0
10	11	32	30	17	10	(90)	2.8
11	10	26	18	35	11	(97)	3.1
12	12	36	22	22	7	(81)	2.8
Total	12	30	22	25	11	(390)	2.9

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was not significant at the .05 level.

In how many of your courses are you satisfied with the methods used to teach the courses?

(Student Opinion Question 25)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	None	Few	About Half	Most	All		
9	3%	16%	23%	36%	21%	(117)	3.6
10	0	18	24	42	16	(88)	3.6
11	3	28	33	25	11	(97)	3.1
12	6	16	36	32	10	(81)	3.2
Total	3	20	29	34	15	(383)	3.4

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was significant at the .01 level.

The t-Test comparisons between grade means were significant at the .05 level for grades nine and eleven.

C. CURRICULUM

How much of what you are studying do you think will be useful to you in everyday living?

(Student Opinion Question 24)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	None	Less Than Half	About Half	Most	Every-thing		
9	2%	8%	24%	29%	37%	(120)	3.9
10	2	8	27	42	21	(88)	3.7
11	1	18	35	29	17	(96)	3.4
12	6	11	38	31	14	(81)	3.3
Total	3	11	31	33	23	(385)	3.6

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was significant at the .01 level.

The t-Test comparisons between grade means were significant at the .05 level for grades nine and twelve, nine and eleven.

Regardless of what your grades may be, in how many of your school subjects would you say that you are "learning a lot" this year?

(Student Opinion Question 26)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	None	Less Than Half	About Half	Most	All		
9	2%	9%	21%	40%	29%	(118)	3.9
10	1	7	21	43	28	(88)	3.9
11	2	13	30	41	13	(97)	3.5
12	3	8	30	35	25	(80)	3.7
Total	2	9	25	40	24	(383)	3.8

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was significant at the .02 level.

The t-Test comparisons between grade means were significant at the .05 level for grades ten and eleven.

How many of the things that you should be learning right now are being taught in your school?

(Student Opinion Question 27)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	None	Few	About Half	Most	All		
9	2%	10%	20%	38%	30%	(115)	3.8
10	1	9	31	43	16	(87)	3.6
11	2	21	38	27	12	(98)	3.3
12	6	20	35	33	6	(81)	3.1
Total	3	15	30	35	17	(381)	3.5

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was significant at the .01 level.

The t-Test comparisons between grade means were significant at the .05 level for grades nine and twelve, nine and eleven and ten and twelve.

All things considered, how much do you think you are learning from your schoolwork?

(Student Opinion Question 28)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	Much Less Than I Can	Somewhat Less Than I Can	About Half Of What I Can	Almost All I Can	All That I Can		
9	2%	5%	25%	42%	25%	(114)	3.8
10	1	6	19	53	21	(88)	3.9
11	6	17	34	29	14	(98)	3.3
12	8	5	36	44	8	(80)	3.4
Total	4	8	28	42	18	(380)	3.6

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was significant at the .01 level.

The t-Test comparisons between grade means were significant at the .05 level for grades nine and eleven, nine and twelve and ten and eleven, ten and twelve.

In general, how well satisfied are you with the variety of the subjects that your school offers?

(Student Opinion Question 32)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	Very Dis-satisfied	Dis-satisfied	Neither S Nor D	Satisfied	Very Satisfied		
9	1%	3%	26%	49%	22%	(113)	3.9
10	2	5	22	59	13	(87)	3.7
11	2	24	33	33	9	(98)	3.2
12	4	15	28	41	13	(80)	3.4
Total	2	11	27	45	15	(378)	3.6

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was significant at the .01 level.

The t-Test comparisons between grade means were significant at the .05 level for grades nine and eleven, nine and twelve and ten and eleven.

D. GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING PROGRAM

How much help does your counselor give you in the selection of a college, vocational, or trade school?

(Student Opinion Question 13)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	None I Need	Little I Need	About Half I Need	Most I Need	All I Need		
9	18%	11%	6%	16%	50%	(123)	3.7
10	7	8	17	26	43	(90)	3.9
11	6	31	22	20	20	(98)	3.2
12	15	11	11	25	38	(81)	3.6
Total	12	15	14	21	39	(392)	3.6

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was significant at the .01 level.

The t-Test comparisons between grade means were significant at the .05 level for grades ten and eleven.

How much help does your counselor give you in the selection of courses?

(Student Opinion Question 14)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	None I Need	Little I Need	About Half I Need	Most I Need	All I Need		
9	7%	8%	7%	21%	57%	(122)	4.1
10	6	6	3	28	58	(90)	4.3
11	7	24	22	22	25	(98)	3.3
12	11	9	20	24	37	(81)	3.7
Total	8	12	13	23	45	(391)	3.9

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was significant at the .01 level.

The t-Test comparisons between grade means were significant at the .05 level for grades nine and eleven and ten and eleven, ten and twelve.

In general, are you satisfied with the way you are treated by your counselor?

(Student Opinion Question 15)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	Very Dis-satisfied	Dis-satisfied	Neither S Nor D	Satisfied	Very Satisfied		
9	4%	7%	14%	33%	43%	(122)	4.0
10	3	7	16	33	41	(90)	4.0
11	8	16	32	28	16	(98)	3.3
12	10	5	24	24	38	(81)	3.8
Total	6	9	21	30	35	(391)	3.8

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was significant at the .01 level.

The t-Test comparisons between grade means were significant at the .05 level for grades nine and eleven and ten and eleven.

How much help does your counselor give you in the selection of a vocation?

(Student Opinion Question 16)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	None I Need	Little I Need	About Half I Need	Most I Need	All I Need		
9	20%	12%	14%	20%	35%	(122)	3.4
10	7	13	17	30	34	(88)	3.7
11	24	24	14	28	10	(97)	3.8
12	20	15	12	26	27	(81)	3.3
Total	18	16	14	25	27	(388)	3.3

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was significant at the .01 level.

The t-Test comparisons between grade means were significant at the .05 level for grades nine and eleven and ten and eleven.

How much help does your counselor give you in solving your personal problems?

(Student Opinion Question 17)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	None I Need	Little I Need	About Half I Need	Most I Need	All I Need		
9	30%	9%	8%	20%	33%	(121)	3.2
10	27	13	14	20	25	(84)	3.0
11	33	16	27	16	9	(97)	2.5
12	38	8	16	20	19	(80)	2.8
Total	32	11	16	19	22	(382)	2.9

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was significant at the .01 level.

The t-Test comparisons between grade means were significant at the .05 level for grades nine and eleven.

E. SCHOOL MORALE

How often do you feel that you "belong" in your school?

(Student Opinion Question 4)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	Never	Seldom	About Half The Time	Usually	Always		
9	7%	6%	21%	19%	48%	(122)	4.0
10	6	6	9	32	48	(90)	4.1
11	7	13	26	25	29	(97)	3.5
12	9	5	25	19	43	(81)	3.8
Total	7	7	20	23	42	(390)	3.9

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was significant at the .01 level.

The t-Test comparisons between grade means were significant at the .05 level for grades ten and eleven.

In general, how proud or ashamed of your school are you?

(Student Opinion Question 29)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	Very Ashamed	Ashamed	Neither P Nor A	Proud	Very Proud		
9	7%	7%	32%	33%	22%	(114)	3.6
10	2	2	45	26	24	(87)	3.7
11	5	22	38	24	11	(98)	3.1
12	8	11	36	29	16	(80)	3.4
Total	6	11	37	28	19	(379)	3.4

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was significant at the .01 level.

The t-Test comparisons between grade means were significant at the .05 level for grades nine and eleven and ten and eleven.

How would you rate "school spirit" at your school? (Consider students' support of athletic teams, charity drives, class money-raising projects, etc.)

(Student Opinion Question 30)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	Very Poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent		
9	8%	3%	25%	42%	22%	(114)	3.7
10	5	5	26	34	32	(86)	3.8
11	7	28	43	16	6	(98)	2.9
12	15	10	34	29	13	(80)	3.1
Total	9	11	32	31	18	(378)	3.4

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was significant at the .01 level.

The t-Test comparisons between grade means were significant at the .05 level for grades nine and eleven, nine and twelve and ten and eleven, ten and twelve.

In general, are you satisfied with your school?

(Student Opinion Question 31)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	Very Dis-satisfied	Dis-satisfied	Neither S Nor D	Satisfied	Very Satisfied		
9	7%	7%	27%	45%	15%	(113)	3.6
10	1	6	33	47	13	(87)	3.6
11	4	37	25	24	11	(98)	3.0
12	6	10	33	36	15	(80)	3.4
Total	5	15	29	38	14	(378)	3.4

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was significant at the .01 level.

The t-Test comparisons between grade means were significant at the .05 level for grades nine and eleven and ten and eleven.

F. SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

If you had a problem or suggestion for the administration, how long would you have to wait to talk to a member of the administration?

(Student Opinion Question 18)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	Could Not Talk At All	Within A Month	Within A Week	Within The Day	Immediately		
9	16%	7%	26%	36%	15%	(122)	3.3
10	12	6	31	46	6	(87)	3.3
11	18	20	32	27	4	(97)	2.8
12	11	10	33	39	8	(80)	3.2
Total	15	10	30	37	9	(386)	3.1

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was significant at the .01 level.

The t-Test comparisons between grade means were significant at the .05 level for grades nine and eleven and ten and eleven.

In general, are you satisfied with the way you are treated by the administration?

(Student Opinion Question 19)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither S Nor D	Satisfied	Very Satisfied		
9	9%	8%	38%	37%	9%	(120)	3.3
10	10	7	40	39	3	(89)	3.2
11	15	27	40	17	2	(96)	2.6
12	18	6	41	30	5	(80)	3.0
Total	13	12	40	31	5	(385)	3.0

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was significant at the .01 level.

The t-Test comparisons between grade means were significant at the .05 level for grades ten and eleven and nine and eleven.

In general, how often does the administration seem to really care about you as an individual?

(Student Opinion Question 20)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	Never	Seldom	About Half The Time	Usually	Always		
9	20%	25%	17%	23%	15%	(120)	2.9
10	18	33	20	27	2	(89)	2.6
11	20	31	28	17	4	(96)	2.5
12	26	29	18	19	9	(80)	2.6
Total	21	29	21	22	8	(385)	2.7

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was not significant at the .05 level.

Are you satisfied with the way the administration includes the students in making decisions about matters which directly affect the students (dress code, assemblies, etc.)?

(Student Opinion Question 21)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	Very Dis-satisfied	Dis-satisfied	Neither S Nor D	Satisfied	Very Satisfied		
9	16%	12%	26%	30%	17%	(121)	3.2
10	14	16	33	29	8	(90)	3.0
11	25	27	33	10	5	(97)	2.4
12	28	22	28	20	1	(81)	2.4
Total	20	19	30	23	9	(389)	2.8

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was significant at the .01 level.

The t-Test comparisons between grade means were significant at the .05 level for grades ten and eleven, ten and twelve and nine and eleven, nine and twelve.

How much personal encouragement does the administration give you concerning your schoolwork?

(Student Opinion Question 22)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	None I Need	Little I Need	About Half I Need	Most I Need	All I Need		
9	20%	22%	25%	17%	16%	(119)	2.9
10	23	26	21	24	7	(88)	2.7
11	24	22	28	21	6	(97)	2.6
12	30	20	28	19	4	(81)	2.5
Total	24	22	26	20	9	(385)	2.7

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was not significant at the .05 level.

Does the administration talk to you as an individual on all occasions?

(Student Opinion Question 23)

Grade Level	Percents Of Student Responses					Number Responding	Mean Scores
	Never	Seldom	About Half The Time	Usually	Always		
9	38%	20%	17%	16%	9%	(120)	2.4
10	33	28	18	17	5	(89)	2.3
11	27	35	21	16	2	(97)	2.3
12	37	35	10	15	4	(81)	2.1
Total	34	29	17	16	5	(387)	2.3

One-way analysis of variance test for the difference among grade means was not significant at the .05 level.

A. Safe and Orderly Environment

There is an orderly, purposeful atmosphere which is free from the threat of physical harm. However, the atmosphere is not oppressive and is conducive to teaching and learning.

Item No.	Statement	Percents of Responses				
		Strongly Disagree	Dis-agree	Unde-cided	Agree	Strongly Agree
1.	This school is a safe and secure place to work	14%	49%	8%	23%	6%
8.	Most students in this school are eager and enthusiastic about learning	23	44	5	23	5
9.	The physical condition of this school building is, generally, unpleasant and unkempt	41	50	1	7	1
16.	Students in this school abide by school rules	12	37	6	41	4
21.	Generally, discipline is not an issue in this school	29	38	7	20	6
34.	The school building is neat, bright, clean and comfortable	4	11	0	58	28
37.	Staff and students do not view security as an issue in this school	44	36	2	14	4
48.	A positive feeling permeates the school	16	27	14	32	11

B. Clear School Mission

There is a clearly-articulated mission for the school through which the staff shares an understanding of and a commitment to instructional goals, priorities, assessment procedures, and accountability.

Item No.	Statement	Percents of Responses				
		Strongly Disagree	Dis-agree	Unde-cided	Agree	Strongly Agree
6.	A written statement of purpose that is the driving force behind most important decisions exists in this school	11%	42%	11%	33%	4%
28.	At this school, reteaching and specific skill remediation are important parts of the teaching process	8	14	15	50	14
47.	The results of the High School Proficiency Exam are used to program students into appropriate classes in this school	12	33	28	22	5

C. Instructional Leadership

The principal or department head acts as the instructional leader who effectively communicates the mission of the school to the staff, parents, and students, and who understands and applies the characteristics of instructional effectiveness in the management of the instructional program of the school.

Item No.	Statement	Percents of Responses				
		Strongly Disagree	Dis-agree	Unde-cided	Agree	Strongly Agree
3.	Most problems facing this school can be solved by the principal and faculty without a great deal of outside help	13%	25%	4%	45%	13%
7.	Teachers in my department consult with my department head about instructional concerns or problems	9	21	9	50	12
10.	The principal is highly visible throughout the school	7	47	6	37	4
14.	The principal is an important instructional resource person in this school	16	40	10	22	12
17.	My department head requires and regularly reviews lesson plans . . .	5	12	9	46	28
20.	Discussions with my department head often result in improved instructional practices	10	22	22	30	16
22.	The principal is very active in securing resources, arranging opportunities and promoting staff development activities for the faculty	13	34	10	31	13
24.	My department head makes several formal classroom observations each year	9	22	14	40	16
26.	The principal is accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction	9	24	11	42	15

(more)

C. Instructional Leadership, Continued

Item No.	Statement	Percents of Responses				
		Strongly Disagree	Dis-agree	Unde-cided	Agree	Strongly Agree
29.	Teachers in my department meet with our department head regularly to discuss what the department head will observe during classroom observations	10%	29%	21%	29%	11%
31.	The principal rarely makes informal contacts with students and teachers around the school . . .	23	34	12	27	5
35.	Formal observations by my department head are regularly followed by a post-observation conference	6	20	16	37	21
38.	An instructional improvement plan usually results from a post-observation conference with my department head	6	27	26	26	15
39.	There is clear, strong, centralized instructional leadership from the principal in this school	14	28	20	26	12
42.	The principal leads frequent formal discussions concerning instruction and student achievement	9	40	21	24	6

D. High Expectations

The school displays a climate of expectation in which the staff believes and demonstrates that students can attain mastery of basic skills and that they (the staff) have the capability to help students achieve such mastery.

Item No.	Statement	Percents of Responses				
		Strongly Disagree	Dis-agree	Unde-cided	Agree	Strongly Agree
2.	In this school, low-achieving students present more discipline problems than other students	6%	17%	5%	48%	24%
13.	Most of the present ninth grade students in this school can be expected to complete high school	20	41	12	25	3
18.	Teachers in this school believe they are responsible for all students mastering all basic skills at each grade level	11	37	17	28	6
27.	Low-achieving students usually answer questions as often as other students in my classroom	10	44	19	17	10
32.	Teachers believe that every student in this school can master basic skills as a direct result of the instructional program	6	40	12	28	14

E. Opportunity to Learn and Student Time-On-Task

Teachers allocate a significant amount of classroom time to instruction in basic skill areas. For a high percentage of that allocated time, students are engaged in planned learning activities.

Item No.	Statement	Percents of Responses				
		Strongly Disagree	Dis-agree	Unde-cided	Agree	Strongly Agree
12.	During basic skills instruction, students are working independently on seatwork for the majority of the allocated time	4%	26%	35%	33%	3%
25.	Class atmosphere in this school is, generally, very conducive to learning for all students	5	27	15	44	9
33.	There are few interruptions during class time	26	28	11	30	5
40.	Teachers in this school plan assignments so that students will be highly successful during the practice work that follows direct instruction	3	11	30	44	13
46.	Daily lessons in this school typically included the following elements: teacher presentation, student practice, specific feedback, evaluation of student performance	3	10	17	57	14

F. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress

Feedback on student academic progress is frequently obtained. Multiple assessment methods such as teacher-made tests, samples of students' work, mastery skills checklists, criterion-referenced tests and norm-referenced tests are used. The results of testing are used to improve individual student performance and also to improve the instructional program.

Item No.	Statement	Percents of Responses				
		Strongly Disagree	Dis-agree	Unde-cided	Agree	Strongly Agree
4.	Criterion-referenced tests are used to assess basic skills throughout the school	4%	21%	32%	39%	5%
11.	There is no systematic, regular assessment of students' basic skills in most classrooms	18	45	16	17	4
19.	Multiple assessment methods are used to assess student progress in basic skills (e.g., criterion-referenced tests, work samples, mastery checklists, etc.)	3	19	23	43	13
41.	Teachers give students specific feedback on daily assignments	4	6	30	51	9
44.	The standardized testing program is an accurate and valid measure of the basic skills curriculum in this school	10	36	22	28	4

C. Home-School Relations

Parents understand and support the basic mission of the school and are made to feel that they have an important role in achieving this mission.

Item No.	Statement	Percents of Responses				
		Strongly Disagree	Dis-agree	Unde-cided	Agree	Strongly Agree
5.	Most parents would rate this school as superior	17%	54%	9%	16%	4%
15.	Beyond parent conferences and report cards, teachers in this school use several other ways for communicating student progress to parents	3	16	11	58	12
23.	There is an active parent-school group in this school that involves many parents	16	35	11	28	10
30.	Teachers and parents are aware of the homework policy in this school	3	20	6	56	16
36.	Almost all students complete assigned homework before coming to school	38	35	15	9	4
43.	During parent-teacher conferences, there is a focus on student achievement and basic skills mastery	6	6	11	56	20
45.	Parent-teacher conferences result in specific plans for home/school cooperation aimed at improving student classroom achievement	5	34	9	44	8